

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/854,623	05/15/2001	Stephen K. Vernon	15-0259 8013		
75	590 09/28/2005		EXAM	INER	
Christopher P. Harris			FERRIS, DERRICK W		
Tarolli, Sundhe	im, Covell & Tumming	LLP			
526 Superior Avenue, Suite 1111			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Cleveland, OH 44114-1400			2663		

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	U
Advisory Action	09/854,623	VERNON, STEPHEN	K.
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Derrick W. Ferris	2663	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addres	SS
THE REPLY FILED 12 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE TH	IS APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	•
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notation (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evidence compliance with 37 CFI	ce, which R 41.31; or
 a)		e final rejection, whichever is	slater In no
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		RST REPLY WAS FILED V	OWT NIHTIV
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension for final Office action; or (2) as	ee under 37 set forth in (b)
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of t	he appeal.
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f will not be entered bea	ralise
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co			,aus c
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	ow);		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying th	e issues for
appeal; and/or (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.	
NOTE: <u>see below</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment (P	'TOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a 	• ——	timely filed amendmen	t canceling
the non-allowable claim(s).	·		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		rill be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented.	al and/or appellant fails See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after o	entry is below or attache	d.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see below.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowand	e because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	
13. Other:		10081	
		RICKY NGO PRIMARY EXAM!	NER
			, ,,,,,,,

Sh7105

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

The examiner thanks applicant for making a correction to claim 16 with respect to the claim objection. Should applicant file a separate amendment for claim 16 then the examiner would withdraw the claim objection due to applicant's amendment for claim 11 (see below). As to claim 1, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's argument. Here applicant argues all packets (or data) are not fixed since each packet (or data) is treated differently. The above subtle difference is not recited in the claims. In particular, the claims recite a single packet (or data) and not necessarily all packets (or data). A single packet (or data) is delayed a fixed delay based in part on a packet's size and predefined delayed parameters, see e.g., paragraph 0037 on page 3 and page 6, paragraph 0052 of Gracon. Thus the claim limitation is met.

As to claim 3, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's argument. See similar reasoning above for claim 1. In addition, the values are stored in memory where the memory is a configuration table (i.e., in order to perform an instruction a processor must store results in memory).

As to claim 11, the claim amendment may require further search and/or reconsideration as applicant has amended the claim to further recite that the fixed delay is slowly adjusted over time by the low pass filter.

As to claims 19 and 26, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's argument. Here packets are serviced if they are queued based on the packet descriptor information. Thus using a reasonable but broad interpretation of the claims, the packets that meet the above criteria are delayed.

As to claims 20 and 27, applicant's argument is persuasive and thus the claim rejection is withdrawn for these claims.

As to claims 5, 6, 10, 15, 16, 23, 29, 24, and 30, see similar reasoning above for claim 1.